

Diesel NOx Emission Reduction Technologies

Chris Lindhjem ENVIRON International Corporation

March 17, 2003



Review of Area Air Quality Plans

- Senate Bill 5 established a program to fund projects to reduce NOx emissions from most diesel engines
- Houston-Galveston Area SIP plans allow for offsets of mandated control measures with other emission reductions
- Texas expects voluntary emission reductions



Review of Diesel Emission Reduction Technologies

- Overview of technologies
- Verification status and reduction potential
- Cost effectiveness estimates
- Recommendations for improvements

ENVIRON











Technology Review

- Fuel options (cetane enhancers, Fischer-Tropsch, fuel/water emulsions)
- New engine/equipment/vehicle (accelerated turnover to lower emitting engines (diesel or CNG/LNG), possible hybrid-electric designs)
- Retrofit technologies (water injection or inlet air humidification, injection modifications, more extensive engine modification, EGR, lean NOx catalysts, SCR, NOx adsorbers, plasma catalysts)



Fuel Measures

- Fuel reformulation (EPA review documents)
 - Cetane enhancers
 - (decreases NOx by 1 to 2 %)
 - Other diesel reformulation
 - 12 to 14% reduction from Texas Low Emission Diesel (LED) possible
 - Fuel/water emulsions
 - 13% from on-road and 20% from off-road engines



New Engine\Vehicle Options

- Most prevalent project type
 - Certified engines
- Accelerated turnover approach
 - On-road engines pull ahead to 2004 standards
 - Off-road Tier 2/3 engines
- CNG/LNG moderately lower emitting than diesel engines
- Could include hybrid-electric drive trains



Potential Retrofit Options

- Options (expected % reduction)
 - − Water injection or Humidified inlet air (~20%)
 - Injection timing modification (~25%)
 - EGR (up to 50% reduction)
 - Lean NOx reduction catalysts (20 35%)
 - Selective Catalytic Reduction (up to 90%)
 - NOx adsorber or plasma catalysts (up to 90%; only prototypes available)
- No retrofit options have been given verification



Other Retrofit Options

- Turbine engines (power source with low NOx emissions)
- Electrification; replace either diesel or SI engines
- Fuel or Solar Cells
- Retrofit of SI three-way catalysts



Cost Effectiveness

Two kinds of Cost Effectiveness

- annualized over life of project
- 1-year where total cost divided by annual reduction

California Carl Moyer experience

- On-road projects \$5,200/ton, annualized
- Off-road projects \$2,500/ton, annualized
- Overall 1-year cost effectiveness; \$19,000/ton

TERP experience;

- $\sim 10,000/ton$ annualized
- − ~\$40,000/ton 1-year cost effectiveness



Recommendations

- Compare cost effectiveness of measures to offset required emission controls
- Mid-course review of HGA SIP will change the nature of control measures and other opportunities